This is a repository copy of *Improving Citizenship Education*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/142848/

Version: Accepted Version

Book Section:

Improving Citizenship Education

(Accepted manuscript)

Dr James Weinberg, Sheffield Methods Institute, University of Sheffield
Professor Matthew Flinders, Sir Bernard Crick Centre, University of Sheffield

The very premise of this book seeks to identify positive and progressive manifestos for democratic renewal and, in their commitment to that mission statement, the chapters thus far have made clear the crisis of contemporary democracy (see also Runciman, 2018). In this context, political science has arguably been preoccupied with supply-side theories of democratic design and demand-side studies of populism or extra-statal politics, but there has been only nascent consideration given to the role of education in both promoting political engagement and cultivating deeper understandings of democratic politics. Twenty years since the publication of the final report of the Advisory Group on Citizenship (henceforth AGC/ 'Crick Report') - which led to the introduction of citizenship education as a statutory feature of the UK national curriculum - this chapter makes three inter-related arguments:

> (1) citizenship education can play a major role in promoting political understanding and participation;
>
> (2) citizenship education as it has been implemented in the UK has generally not lived-up to this potential; and
>
> (3) this raises distinctive questions about the existence of blockages, barriers and the 'politics of' citizenship education more broadly.

In order to substantiate and tease apart these arguments, this chapter is divided into four main sections. The first section introduces citizenship education as a normatively contested concept and describes its introduction as statutory feature of education in the UK. The second section reviews the existing research and data on the impact of citizenship education globally in order to reveal the existence of particular correlations with socio-political outcomes (Schulz et al., 2009). The third, most substantive section identifies a gap between the 'Crick vision' laid out twenty years previous (QCA, 1998) and the delivered reality of citizenship education in the UK. At the macro-level of education policy, this section traces an 'implementation gap' under New Labour and a 'vision shift' under the subsequent Coalition and Conservative governments that have broadly eviscerated the radical potential of citizenship education. The fourth and final section offers a number of solutions that seek to realign citizenship education with the principles of shared governance and democratic citizenship. These suggestions incorporate practical recommendations for teacher training and school-based delivery of citizenship education as well as more abstract proposals for reconceiving policy and public discourse in a way that supports globalised, communitarian and critically active conceptions of the subject.

I. Citizenship Education in Theory and Practice

As David Kerr (2000, pp.74-75) highlighted almost twenty years ago – yet the sentiment seems no less applicable today – worries abound regarding the 'seemingly pervasive erosion of the social, political, economic and moral fabric of society in England, in the face of rapid economic and social change'. To some extent, concern regarding the rise of political alienation, distrust, and representative inequalities – the end of Almond and Verba's so-called *Civic Culture* (1963) - is not new and in this sense the Trilateral Commission's report of 1974, *The Crisis of Democracy*, provides a critical reference point. It was these sentiments that underpinned the Crick Report's (1998, p.8) focus on 'worrying levels of apathy, ignorance and cynicism about public life', which 'could and should be remedied' (Ibid., p.16). The policy response placed citizenship education (henceforth CE) onto the National Curriculum in England for all secondary level students (aged 11-16), as effective from September 2002.

Although increasingly in vogue in policy circles in recent years, there remains contestation about what CE means, how it should be taught, and what it should aim to achieve. Citizenship and accordingly CE have, historically, been incredibly fluid terms. From the city-state visions of classical writers such as Plato and Aristotle to the 'mirror of princes' literature in early modern period, the nation-state era of the industrial revolution to the post-colonial, post-material decades of the latter 20th and early 21st centuries, the requirements and envisioned outcomes of CE have been bound to the ebbs and flows of philosophical and governing thought. The challenges now facing the UK, and indeed much of Europe, are as equally unique as at any time in our history, and as such they require careful consideration of how CE might, in a contemporary, postmodern setting, facilitate sustained democratisation.

In sum, we argue that CE should support the ideals of democracy as an outcome, where that term is understood as both a type of government and a set of practices; that subsequently CE must incorporate some balance of knowledge, skills, and values; and that these three components of CE should encourage students to develop a range of democratic competences (cf. Hoskins et al., 2015). Whilst the labelling of these competences is contested in the academic literature, a number of national and international policy documents have attempted to collate them. Following the adoption of a 'Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education' (Council of Europe, 2010), the Council of Europe conceived four categories of competences covering knowledge, skills, attitudes and values, which it claims 'enable an individual to participate effectively and appropriately in a culture of democracy' (Council of Europe 2016, p. 12; Table 1, below). These competences, regardless of the nomenclature, usefully cover the majority of referents used in the academic literature on CE.

How these competences may be utilised, understood and operationalised in national settings relies, as Kerr (1999) argues, upon contextual and structural factors. Whilst cultural factors refer to the traditions, geography, economic ideologies and socio-political history of a country, structural factors incorporate the organisation of its education system, including funding and targets. Combined, these conditions produce a spectrum of conceptions and applications of democratic competences in CE that reproduce McLaughlin's (1992) distinction between 'minimal' and 'maximal' citizenship. The autarchic, minimal citizen is taught to be law-abiding

and public spirited; the maximal or autonomous citizen is encouraged to be highly active and ultimately commands a 'distanced critical perspective on all important matters' (Ibid., p.242). The

Table 1. Citizenship Competences

Interacting effectively and constructively with others	Thinking critically	Acting in a socially responsible manner	Acting democratically
Self-confidence	Multi-perspectivity	Respect for justice	Respect for democracy
Responsibility	Reasoning and analysis skills	Solidarity	Knowledge of political institutions
Autonomy (personal initiative)	Data interpretation	Respect for other human beings	Knowledge of political processes (e.g. elections)
Respect for different opinions or beliefs	Knowledge discovery and use of sources	Respect for human rights	Knowledge of international organisations, treaties and declarations
Cooperation	Media literacy	Sense of belonging	
Conflict resolution	Creativity	Sustainable development	
Empathy	Exercising judgement	Environmental protection	Interacting with political authorities
Self-awareness	Understanding the present world	Cultural heritage protection	Knowledge of fundamental political and social concepts
Communicating and listening	Questioning		
Emotional awareness		Knowing about or respecting other cultures	Respect for rules
Flexibility or adaptability			Participating
Inter-cultural skills		Knowing about or respecting religions	Knowledge of or participation in civil society
		Non-discrimination	

Source: Council of Europe (2016)

difference, when it comes to education for democratic citizenship, is between 'Education ABOUT citizenship…Education THROUGH citizenship…Education FOR citizenship' (Kerr, 2000, p. 210). At one end of this continuum, liberal and neoliberal models of CE promote individual rights and responsibilities alongside a small but strong state (Keating, 2014). At the other end is a communitarian vision of citizenship and CE, in which citizens are organic parts of a polity comprised of diverse interests. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) characterise the citizens 'produced' along this spectrum, identifying the critically equipped justice-oriented citizen as the ideal-type (Table 2).

For Sir Bernard Crick – who chaired the AGC and whose report led to the introduction of CE on the National Curriculum in England – the act of politics and democratic citizenship pivoted upon the active contestation of public policy *by the public*, and in turn the peaceful reconciliation of that

Table 2: Three Types of Citizen

	THE INDIVIDUALIZED CITIZEN	THE PARTICIPATORY CITIZEN	THE JUSTICE-ORIENTED CITIZEN
Nature	Acts responsibly in his/her community. Works and pays taxes. Obeys laws. Recycles, gives blood. Volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis.	Active member of community organizations and/or improvement efforts. Organizes community efforts to care for those in need, promote economic development, or clean up the environment. Knows how government agencies work. Knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks	Critically assesses social, political and economic structures to see beyond surface causes. Seeks out and addresses areas of injustice Knows about democratic social movements and how to effect systemic change
Behaviour	Contributes food to a food drive	Helps to organise a food drive	Explores why people are hungry and acts to solve root causes
Assumptions	To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must have good character, they must be honest, responsible and law-abiding members of the community	To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must actively participate and take leadership positions within established systems and community structures	To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must question, debate and change established systems and structures that reproduce patterns of injustice over time.

Source. Westheimer and Kahne (2004, p. 240)

process through meaningful debate (1963). Steeped in civic republican theory and supported by the then Education Secretary David Blunkett, who recognised that a new mode of CE needed to go beyond teaching the formalities of government and governance (Pollard, 2004), Crick directed a vision for CE in England that conceived citizenship as not simply a state of membership but as an activity. The final report defined CE in three strands:

> 1. Social and moral responsibility – learning from the very beginning self-confidence and socially and morally responsible behaviour both in and beyond the classroom, both towards those in authority and towards each other;
> 2. Community involvement – learning and becoming helpfully involved in the life and concerns of their communities, including learning through community involvement and service to the community;
> 3. Political literacy – learning about and how to make themselves effective in public life though knowledge, skills and values' (DfEE/QCA, 1998, pp. 11-13).

The introduction of CE as a statutory subject in England took place against a backdrop of immense constitutional reform in the UK. It was, as Anthony Giddens (2000, pp.23-24) commented, 'extraordinarily important [...as part of New Labour's] programmes of political change'. Giddens located the introduction of citizenship education within a 'Second Wave Democratisation' that extended to include the implementation of the Human Rights Act 1998, devolution to a Scottish

Parliament and a Welsh Assembly, and a new peace settlement in Northern Ireland. Underpinned by principles of experiential learning, the Crick Report offered a deeper, more collective and engaged vision of justice-oriented CE.

II. The Impact of Citizenship Education

The previous section briefly outlined the theoretical debate surrounding CE and its introduction in England. It argued that different ideas about what democracy is or what 'learning *for* democracy' actually is or should be translate directly into varying commitments to national education policies as well as more specific forms of pedagogy, curriculum, and assessment. This section now engages with the extant research on the impact of CE in England and abroad to argue that CE, effectively and consistently delivered, has the potential to a) improve young people's political outcomes, and b) mitigate socio-economic inequalities in political participation. Taken together, this evidence is used to argue for the radical capacity of CE to overcome barriers to impactful state-citizen cooperation.

In England, the most robust and detailed body of evidence on CE was collected by the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (henceforth CELS), which was commissioned by the Department of Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) to investigate the impact of compulsory CE on school students between 2001 and 2010. The final report noted:

> [T]he CELS cohort [i.e. a group of pupils who were tracked and regularly surveyed during their period of full time education] was more likely to have positive attitudes and intentions towards civic and political participation (both in the present and in the future) if they had high levels of 'received citizenship' (i.e. if they reported having received 'a lot' of citizenship education). (Keating et al., 2010, p. vi)

As the Crick Report stipulated, effective CE would be identifiable where pupils developed a sense of political efficacy, improved their formal political literacy, and became helpfully involved in their local communities (1998, p.11-13). Using CELS data, Paul Whiteley (2014, p.16) shows that - controlling for both civic voluntarism (which links resources to enhanced political involvement) and social capital (which suggests that obligations and expectations in communities can enhance their mutual activity) – levels of exposure to CE across secondary school significantly predicted participants' civic engagement in terms of efficacy, current and anticipated participation, and political knowledge. In Crick's terms, CE had started to achieve success in less than a decade. Dependent on a similar body of research, it is anticipated that the weaker orientation towards exams in the curricula of Scotland and Wales, coupled with greater autonomy for schools and stronger connections between schools and communities (Chitty, 2009), has the potential to improve even further the experiential learning of pupils that is so vital to CE (Kisby and Sloam, 2012).

Avril Keating and Jan Germen Janmaat (2016) have conducted path analysis on CELS data to show that those participants who experienced maximum exposure to citizenship education in school were 14.9% more likely to vote at 18 than those who received minimum delivery in school; similarly, expressive political participation in adulthood increased by 13.1% between the two groups, even after controlling for socio-demographic variables. This research supports previous claims that childhood citizenship education can have lasting effects into adulthood (McFarland

and Thomas, 2006). Focusing specifically on disadvantaged youth in England – where the intergenerational transmission of political disaffection and inequality is strongest (Brady et al., 2015) – Hoskins et al. (2017) utilise CELS data in latent curve analysis to reveal a strong interaction effect between CE and socio-economic variables in determining participants' intention to vote. This research suggests that CE can have a 'compensatory effect' (Campbell, 2008) on students from disadvantaged backgrounds, who do not receive positive political stimuli at home or in their local communities.

The IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) has provided a similar body of data on the effects of CE worldwide. Working with 24 countries around the globe, the latest iteration of this study concludes:

> The links that the ICCS 2016 findings suggest between civic knowledge, school-based experiences with civic engagement, and expectations to vote and participate in other civic activities in adulthood indicate that promotion of civic and citizenship education, in both formal and informal ways, should be considered as an essential means of helping young people become more conscious of their political roles and the importance of being participating citizens. (Schulz et al., 2016, p. 209)

In a related large-n study of the link between political participation and education in Chile, Castillo et al. (2015) found that civic knowledge (of formal political processes) can reduce the effects of socio-economic factors on participation (cf. Hoskins et al., 2017), whilst an open classroom climate (where students question, debate and voice ideas) can do so for cultural variables. These studies continue to provide a powerful justification for policy makers around the world to give renewed attention to CE as an effective tool or policy instrument through which to mitigate the status-participation gap.

The ICCS (Schulz et al., 2016) also revealed diversity in both the content and style of CE programmes. In many parts of the world, the dichotomy between democratic knowledge and skills, minimal and maximal CE, is striking and reflects 'political choices that have political consequences' (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004, p. 237). In far east Asia, for example, a knowledge-heavy curriculum promotes patriotism and 'personally responsible' liberal citizenship over internationalism and justice-oriented active citizenship. Lai and Byram (2012, p. 210) note '[t]he discourse on national and patriotic sentiment [in China] polarises people into the liberal or patriotic camp', stymieing discussion and understanding of democratic politics. This might be contrasted with the skills-focused, participatory programme of CE in Mexico, with its 'strong emphasis on group work, solidarity and the collective good' (Levinson and Elizarrarás, 2017, p. 412), or the depoliticised model of service learning preferred in the US (Ransom, 2009). When these different political agendas and conceptions of CE are placed along the spectrums discussed in section I, it is not surprising – but nevertheless worrying – that only 35% of ICCS participants attained the highest level in the study (Level A), which we would associate here with a range of knowledge, skills and attitudes required of justice-oriented citizenship.[1]

---

[1] 'Students working at the highest level (Level A, called Level 3 in ICCS 2009) are able to make connections between the processes of social and political organization and influence, and the legal and institutional mechanisms used to control them. They generate accurate hypotheses on the benefits, motivations, and likely outcomes of institutional

III. Barriers and Blockages

In the last section, this chapter engaged with a range of research on CE to demonstrate that the transmission of civic knowledge about formal political systems and the experience of democratic school environments can underpin engaged citizenship (e.g. Torney-Purta et al., 2001). In this section, we identify a number of blockages and barriers to effective CE aimed at justice-oriented citizenship in the UK. These reduce to what we call an 'implementation gap' under New Labour and a 'vision shift' under the subsequent Coalition and Conservative governments.

a) The 'Implementation Gap'

Although the CELS revealed a number of positive trends among those who received consistent CE, the participant population represented a small percentage of all secondary school students in England. In 2006 the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) discovered that 'only a few schools…. have created a coherent programme which pupils can recognise as an entity' (2006, para. 69); the final report of the CELS itself echoed these and similar worries that 'CE is delivered by staff with little experience of, expertise in, or enthusiasm for CE' (Keating et al., 2010, p.47). Whilst the initial momentum behind CE was fast-paced and well-resourced, this was a highly symbolic policy that did not ultimately embed within school curricula or the broader governance of education.

CELS reports found that citizenship was only delivered in a discrete timetable slot, separate from PSHE ('personal, social and health education'), in just under a third of schools (Kerr et al. 2007); where these subjects were combined, the final CELS report concluded that it had 'a negative effect on received citizenship and citizenship outcomes' (Keating et al., 2010, p. 5). Although citizenship is a statutory foundation subject with examinable components and recognised as a Progress 8 accountability measure[2], it remains marginalised by schools that are sceptical to give it proportional attention in their timetabling alongside established subjects that have traditionally carried weight in league tables. Crick admitted that '[n]o other curriculum subject was stated so briefly' (2002, p.499), and in many ways it was this light-touch approach that led to the fractured delivery of the subject.

In hindsight, the Crick Report overshot the practicalities of delivering a statutory curriculum subject in its adherence to a theoretical vision of CE. The Report's (1998, pp.23-24) *essential recommendations* only stipulated that schools should spend *up to* and *no more than five percent of curriculum time* on achieving CE outcomes; this is just one example of the ways in which CE became statutory without the usual hallmarks of a core curriculum subject. The potential for 'lossiness' (Trowler, 2003) was immense insofar as official documents were quickly forgotten, summarised and reinterpreted as they progressed through the education system. The first of the CELS interim reports revealed 'limited familiarity [among school personnel] with the key citizenship curriculum

---

policies and citizens' actions. They integrate, justify, and evaluate given positions, policies, or laws according to the principles that underpin them. Students also demonstrate familiarity with broad international economic forces and the strategic nature of active participation' Schulz et al., 2016, p. 200).

[2] For more information, see DfE (2016). Progress 8 How Progress 8 and Attainment 8measures are calculated [Online]. Available at:
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/561021/Progress_8_and_Attainment_8_how_measures_are_calculated.pdf

documents, such as the Curriculum Order and Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) schemes of work, and little or no familiarity with the key policy texts, notably the Crick report and Post-16 report' (Kerr et al. 2003, p. viii).

If curriculum documents were unprecedented in their brevity, then New Labour and subsequent governments have also not done enough to train teachers in the content and associated pedagogy of CE. Although the UK (England) was the first nation in Europe to offer Initial Teacher Training (ITT) in CE, the momentum for this initiative was not sustained. Only 284 Newly Qualified Teachers (NQTs) practiced the subject in 2006 (against a target of 540); in 2010 only 220 CE teacher training places were available; and by 2017 the number of trainee CE teachers reportedly dropped to fewer than 50.[3] The result is that non-specialists, with no formal training and a plethora of competing obligations, must deliver CE. In a recent study with non-specialist teachers delivering CE alongside their main subject in more than 60 schools around England, Weinberg and Flinders (forthcoming) found that a) teachers do not have a shared understanding of citizenship and the purpose of CE; b) there is a distinct gap between academic work on good pedagogy for CE and classroom practice due to an absence of initial teacher training (ITT) and/or continued professional development (CPD) opportunities; c) CE continues to be sorely neglected and/or ignored in state secondary school curricula; and d) where citizenship is taught, it is delivered with individualistic and inward- looking, liberal conceptions of 'good' rather than 'active' citizenship. The last of these findings suggests a worrying link between recent macro-level policy rhetoric and frontline provision. It is to this shift in the politics of CE that we now turn.

b) The 'Vision Shift'

Following the 2010 General Election and the formation of the Liberal Democrat-Conservative coalition government, the policy discourse around CE shifted to the right in ideological terms. We argue that this 'vision shift', characterised by the promotion of a more individualised character education (revolving around minimal citizenship) at the expense of collective active citizenship, is particularly significant for understanding why CE in England is not fulfilling its potential.

The Jubilee Centre at Birmingham University is the foremost centre for character education studies in the UK and takes a broad and unambiguously Aristotelian approach to 'character' as a set of educational outcomes: 'a set of personal traits or dispositions that produce specific moral emotions, inform motivation, and guide conduct' (Jubilee Centre, undated). The concept of 'character' has been operationalised in English education policy - in particular by former Education Secretary Nicky Morgan - as a narrower, more instrumental set of 'traits, attributes and behaviours that underpin success in education and work' (DfE, 2015a). The Government's slimmed-down, character-heavy CE curriculum now diverges substantially from the three strands set out by the Crick Report in 1998. Instead of a model seeking to promote civic and political participation at the meso- and macro-levels (locally, nationally, internationally), the new guidance to schools focuses on promoting 'a sound knowledge and understanding of the role of law...volunteering as well as other forms of responsible activity...[and] enabl[ing] them (students) to manage their money

---

[3] This figure was cited by Liz Moorse, CEO of the Association for Citizenship Teaching, in a recent evidence session for the 2017/18 House of Lords Select Committee on Citizenship and Civic Engagement.
A full transcript can be obtained here:
http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/citizenship-and-civic-engagement-committee/citizenship-and-civic-engagement/oral/72120.html

on a day-to-day basis, and plan for future financial needs' (DfE, 2013, p. 214). Whilst there is evident cross-fertilisation between the moral base of character education and the CE competences put forward by the Council of Europe, the character agenda developed in the UK since 2010 downplays, in particular, the democratic competences of criticality, active participation and political literacy. Put differently, character education is imbued with a neoliberal market-logic that aims to deliver a highly knowledgeable, obedient and employable workforce (cf. Harvey, 2007; Leach, 2017).

At the same time, character education has become a vehicle for the Coalition and Conservative governments of 2010-present to address concerns about multiculturalism and national unity. Following the London riots in August 2011, Prime Minister David Cameron told the nation that this was "not about poverty…No, this was about behaviour…people showing indifference to right and wrong…people with a twisted moral code…people with a complete absence of self-restraint' (Cameron, 2011). This rhetoric is indicative of a 'vision shift' away from communitarian ideals of justice-oriented citizenship and CE, and towards a staunchly individualised, depoliticised, and 'personally responsible' model (Table 2, above; see also Kisby, 2017). There was, for example, no recognition that those young people who rioted in 2011 were doing so out of anger at structural inequalities, inaccessible public services, or an austerity agenda that was hitting them the hardest. In its latest iterations - specifically the Essential Life Skills package presented by the Government in 2017 (DfE, 2017) - character education is an increasingly econocentric strategy that aims to anticipate post-Brexit market volatility. If the UK's departure from the European Union does 'hit hard', it is possible that young people will, as with the riots in 2011, face *personal* blame for the failures of a closed political process conducted in elite circles.

The 'vision shift' identified here also characterises related CE policies in the UK such as Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural education (SMSC), the Prevent Programme, and 'Fundamental British Values'. These policies carry more resource and incentive than discrete CE lessons and at the same time reinforce minimalist conceptions of citizenship. For example, the *Counter Terrorism and Security Act 2015* obliges schools and universities to 'prevent radicalisation' and delineates democracy as 'British value' (DfE, 2015b). As Suke Wolton (2017, p. 2) argues, this legislation directly contradicts centuries of thought in which democracy, where it is meaningful, entails a constant churn of ideas about how society should be governed. Tied to the underlying assumptions of the character agenda, Prevent not only portrays citizens as passive recipients of politics - removing their involvement as Tocquevillian 'associates' in a democratic process - but reduces the democratic space for disaffected youth to question, debate and interrogate ideas openly.

IV. Reimagining Citizenship Education in the UK

This chapter has made a number of arguments. It began by suggesting that conceptions of citizenship can take a variety of forms that range from emphasising the position and rights of the individual to those that emphasise collective values and obligations (Section I). It then proceeded to argue that a robust international evidence base now exists regarding the positive impact of CE in terms of promoting positive attitudes and behaviour, and in terms of helping to correct existing democratic inequalities (Section II). The third section then reviewed the manner in which CE had evolved in the UK since its introduction in 2002 and focused upon the existence of an 'implementation gap' followed by a 'vision shift' (Section III). We could add to this a list of

structural reforms in recent years (academisation, the rise of free schools, and subsequent autonomy from the National Curriculum in particular) that have hollowed out the potential of CE in England. We argue that young people in the England are no less interested in 'the political' than their counter-parts in Europe but their comparative disengagement with formal politics (cf. Sloam, 2014) is an alarming indictment of a system that has ill-equipped them with the skills and knowledge to feel empowered as citizens. To correct this, this section makes a bold case for a *minimum guaranteed offer of CE* for every young person in the country. Underpinning this change there will need to be:

> a) policy reorientation away from the nationalistic and individualised introspection promoted by character education and embodied in Brexit rhetoric;

> b) changes to initial teacher training and CPD that prepare our frontline educators in the art of critical pedagogy; and

> c) new curriculum designs that reconceptualise the horizons of sovereignty (and thus democratic citizenship) for young people.

At the theoretical level, our minimum offer revolves around CE as a participatory endeavour that is 'lived' as much as it is 'learnt'. We take inspiration from the philosophical work of Hannah Arendt and, in particular, her conception of action. For Arendt (1958), action is one of three *vita activa* and corresponds to the human capacity to do something original. Overtly political, it is in this action that we find freedom but it is not a liberal notion of freedom as sovereignty. Rather Arendt's version of freedom as *initium* (beginning) relies upon how a plurality (i.e. a diverse society of interests and opinions) responds to our actions (Arendt, 1977). We are only free, according to Arendt, where we appear and act in the public realm and thus our freedom is interwoven with the freedom of others. This is a highly political understanding of freedom and one akin to civic republican notions of democratic citizenship: '[t]he raison d'etre of politics is freedom and its field of experience is action' (Arendt, 1977, p.146). To harness Arendt's concept of action to CE is not simply to acknowledge the need for a more reciprocal model of learning for democracy but also to view young people as citizens of now, not the future (see also Biesta and Lawy, 2006).

At a practical level, the implementation of this vision for CE requires regular opportunities for young people to participate in the political communities of their classroom, school or society. To facilitate such learning, we find a pedagogic link in the practice of critical pedagogy (McLaren, 2003). The word 'critical' has been a favoured buzzword for repeated curriculum documents in the UK but it is important here to distinguish between critical *thinking* - based on the application of logic but lacking moralistic or ideological content - and critical *pedagogy* - a context-specific pedagogical approach centred on dialogue, synergistic reflection ad action, and a critical consciousness of social injustice. Laura Johnson and Paul Morris (2010, p. 80) identify four distinguishing features of critical pedagogy: the ideological/moral; the collective/social; the subjective/context driven; and praxis (reflection action). Johnson and Morris go on to summarise these elements in a framework for teaching what they term *critical citizenship education* (Table 3). In its focus on providing the conditions for social change and stimulating democratic citizenship through knowledge and skills, we argue that critical pedagogy not only encompasses all four competences set forward by the Council of Europe but also harnesses these to a justice-oriented,

maximal model of CE. As such, CE as critical pedagogy goes back to and beyond the ambitions of the Crick Report, which itself was criticised for overlooking anti-racism and parallel structural inequalities (Osler and Starkey, 2006).

Table 3. Citizenship Education through Critical Pedagogy

	POLITICS/ ideology	SOCIAL/ collective	SELF/subjectivity	PRAXIS/ engagement
Knowledge	Knowledge and understanding of histories, societies, systems, oppressions and injustices, power structures and macro-structural relationships	Knowledge of interconnections between culture, power and transformation; non-mainstream writings and ideas in addition to dominant discourses	Knowledge of own position, cultures and context; sense of identity	Knowledge of how collectively to effect systematic change; how knowledge itself is power; how behaviour influences society and injustice
Skills	Skills of critical and structural social analysis; capacity to politicise notions of culture, knowledge and power; capacity to investigate deeper causalities	Skills in dialogue, cooperation and interaction; skills in critical interpretation of others' viewpoints; capacity to think holistically	Capacity to reflect critically on one's 'status' within communities and society; independent critical thinking; speaking with one's own voice	Skills of critical thinking and active participation; skills in acting collectively to challenge the status quo; ability to imagine a better world
Values	Commitment to values against injustice and oppression	Inclusive dialogical relationship with others' identities and values	Concern for social justice and consideration of self-worth	Informed, responsible and ethical action and reflection
Dispositions	Actively questioning; critical interest in society and public affairs; seeks out and acts against injustice and oppression	Socially aware; cooperative; responsible towards self and others; willing to learn with others	Critical perspective; autonomous; responsible in thought, emotion and action; forward-thinking; in touch with reality	Commitment and motivation to change society; civic courage; responsibility for decisions and actions

Source: Johnson and Morris (2010, p. 90)

To implement a new CE curriculum underpinned by critical pedagogy, which makes manifest Arendt's concept of action and thus learning for democracy in UK schools, will require three clear commitments from policy makers. Firstly, we recommend that the Government not only recommits to training specialist CE teachers but also introduces modules in critical pedagogy and CE as a feature of all ITT schemes. In doing so, it would be following developments in the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Austria, Poland and Slovakia, where all prospective teachers

are now trained during ITE to become semi-specialists of CE (Eurydice, 2017, pp. 133-137). Secondly, the Government must issue effective guidance materials and exemplar resources to all schools. At the moment, the UK is one of only 9 education systems in Europe (out of 42 assessed by the Eurydice network) where top level authorities do not issue guidance documents on CE to teachers (Eurydice, 2017, p.81). By contrast, the *Loi 2013 pour la refondation de l'école de la République* in France introduced a new academic pathway for students' 'Citizenship Journey' (*Parcours Citoyen*), which is supported by online and printed resources for all schools and teachers.

Finally, the UK Government must introduce a more globalised National Curriculum in general, and for CE in particular. The global financial crash of 2007/08, increasing concerns about the sustainability of human development and climate change, mass migration across continents and conflict resolution, as well as the spread of instant worldwide communication technologies, are just a few recent changes that are directly pertinent to critical citizenship education and, in turn, truly global in nature. To tackle these and similar issues will, increasingly, require a global community of democratic, justice-oriented citizens. In fact, we argue that Brexit should provide the trigger for a fully-fledged review of the state of CE in the UK. Two decades on from the original Crick Report, Brexit has recast a spotlight on a range of socio-political challenges: concern regarding social fragmentation and divided communities, rising levels of anti-political sentiment and falling levels of political trust, evidence-based concerns regarding social mobility, damagingly wide levels of inequality, anxiety regarding increasing poverty, and uncertainties about the UK's future in the international arena. The twentieth anniversary of the Crick Report thus provides an opportunity to address what appears to be an increasingly frail and worn social fabric, and the need to emphasise what unites individuals and communities rather than what pulls us apart. Though not a panacea, the need for a communitarian model of active CE has arguably never been greater.

References

Advisory Group on Citizenship (AGC)/Department for Education (DfEE)/Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA). (1998) *Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools.* London: HMSO.

Almond, G. and Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture.* 1st ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Arendt, H. (1977). *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Biesta, G. and Lawy, R. (2006). From teaching citizenship to learning democracy: overcoming individualism in research, policy and practice. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(1), pp. 63-79.

Brady, H.E., Schlozman, K.L. and Verba, S. (2015). Political Mobility and Political Reproduction from Generation to Generation. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 657(1), pp.149-173.

Campbell, D.E. (2008). Voice in the classroom: How an open classroom climate fosters political engagement among adolescents. *Political Behaviour*, 30(4), pp.437-454.

Cameron, D. (2011) *PM's speech on the Fightback after the Riots.* [Online]. Available at: www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pms-speech-on-the-fightback-after-the-riots [Accessed 20.11.16].

Castillo, J.C., Miranda, D., Bonhomme, M., Cox, C. and Bascopé, M. (2015). Mitigating the political participation gap from the school: the roles of civic knowledge and classroom climate. *Journal of Youth Studies,* 18(1), pp.16-35.

Chitty, C. (2009). *Education Policy in Britain.* Basingstoke, Palgrave.

Council of Europe (2016). *Competences for democratic culture - Living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Crick, B. (1962). *In Defense of Politics.* London: Continuum.

Crick, B. (2002). Education for citizenship: The citizenship order. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 55, pp. 488–504.

Department for Education (DfE). (2013). *The National Curriculum in England: Framework Document, September.* London: DfE.

Department for Education (DfE). (2015a). *Character Education: Apply for 2015 Grant Funding, 12 January.* [Online] DfE. Available at: www.gov.uk/government/news/character-educationapply-for-2015-grant-funding [Accessed 15.06. 16].

Department of Education (2015b). *Protecting children from radicalisation: the prevent duty. Department of Education* [Online]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/protecting-children-fromradicalisation-the-prevent-duty [accessed 01.05.2016].

Department for Education (2017). *Plans launched to drive social mobility in Opportunity Areas* [Online]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/news/plans-launched-to-drive-social-mobility-in-opportunity-areas [accessed 27.10.17].

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2017). *Citizenship Education at School in Europe – 2017. Eurydice Report.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Giddens, A. (2000). Citizenship education in the global era. In Pearce, N. and Hallgarten, J. (eds.), *Tomorrow's Citizens: Critical Debates in Citizenship and Education.* IPPR, pp. 23–4.

Harvey, D. (2007). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism.* Oxford: OUP.

Hoskins, B., Saisana, M. and Villalba, C., (2015). Civic competence of youth in Europe: Measuring cross national variation through the creation of a composite indicator. *Social Indicators Research*, 123(2), pp. 431-457.

Hoskins, B., Germen Janmaat, J., Melis, G. (2017). Tackling inequalities in political socialisation: A systematic analysis of access to and mitigation effects of learning citizenship at school. *Social Science Research* [Online]. Available at: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049089X16304458 [accessed 29.12.17]

Johnson, L. and Morris, P. (2010). Towards a framework for critical citizenship education. *The Curriculum Journal*, 21(1), pp. 77-96.

Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues (undated). *A Framework for Character Education in Schools* [Online]. Available at: jubileecentre.ac.uk/userfiles/jubileecentre/pdf/character - education/Framework%20for%20Character%20 Education.pdf [accessed 01.11.17]

Keating, A. (2014). *Education for Citizenship in Europe. European Policies, National Adaptations and Young People's Attitudes.* Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Keating, A., Kerr, D., Benton, T., Mundy, E. and Lopes, J. (2010) *Citizenship education in England 2001-2010: young people's practices and prospects for the future: the eighth and final report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS). Research Report DFE-RR059.* London: DfE.

Keating, A. and Janmaat, J.G. (2016) Education Through Citizenship at School: Do School Activities Have a Lasting Impact on Youth Political Engagement? *Parliamentary Affairs*, 69, pp.409–429.

Kerr, D. (1999). Citizenship education in the curriculum: An international review. *The School Field*, 10(3/4), pp. 5-32.

Kerr, D. (2000). Citizenship Education: An International Comparison. In Lawton, D., Cairns, J. and Gardner, R. (eds.), *Education for Citizenship.* London: Continuum, pp. 200-227.

Kerr, D, Cleaver, E., Ireland, E., and Blenkinsop, S. (2003). *Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: First Cross-sectional Survey. 2001-2002*. London: DfES.

Kerr, D., Lopes, J., Nelson, J., White, K., Cleaver, E. and Benton, T. (2007). *Vision versus Pragmatism: Citizenship in the secondary school curriculum in England*. London: DfES.

Kisby, B., and Sloam, J. (2012). Citizenship, Democracy and Education in the UK: Towards a Common framework for Citizenship lessons in the Four Home Nations. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 65, pp. 68-89.

Lai, P. and Byram, M. (2012). *Re-shaping Education for Citizenship: Democratic National Citizenship in Hong Kong*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Leach, T. (2017). *Democracy in the classroom. Power and Education (In Press at time of writing)*, [Also Online]. Available at: http://ray.yorksj.ac.uk/id/eprint/2404/ [accessed 02.09.17].

Levinson, B.A. and Elizarrarás, M.E.L. (2017). Stealth Diversity and the Indigenous Question: The Challenges of Citizenship in Mexican Civic Education. In Banks, J.A. (ed.), *Citizenship Education and Global Migration: Implications for Theory, Research and Teaching*. Washington: AERA, pp. 403-429.

Maitles, H. (2017) What type of democratic citizenship education? What type of democratic citizen? *Academia*, 9, pp. 6-26.

McFarland, D. A. and Thomas, R. J. (2006). Bowling Young: How Youth Voluntary Associations Influence Adult Political Participation. *American Sociological Review,* 71, pp.401–425.

McLaren, P. (2003). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In Darder, A. and Baltodano, M., and Torres, R.D. (eds.) *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York and London: RoutledgeFalmer (pp. 69–97)

McLaughlin, T.H. (1992). Citizenship, diversity and education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, 21(3), pp. 235–50.

Ofsted (2006). *Towards consensus? Citizenship in secondary schools*. London: HMI

Osler, A. and Starkey, H. (2006). Education for democratic citizenship: A review of research, policy and practice 1995–2005. *Research Papers in Education*, 21(4), pp.433–66.

Pollard, S. (2004). *David Blunkett*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Ransom, L.S. (2009). Sowing the seeds of citizenship and social justice: service-learning in a public speaking course. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 4(3), pp.211–224.

Runciman, D. (2018) *How Democracy Ends*. United Kingdom: Profile Books.

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., Agrusti, G., and Friedman, T. (2016) *Becoming Citizens in a Changing World: IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016 International Report*. Amsterdam: Springer Open.

Sloam, J. (2014). New voice, less equal: the civic and political engagement of young people in the United States and Europe. *Comparative Political Studies*, 47(5), pp. 663-688.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., and Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen.* Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Trowler, P. (2003). *Education policy.* London: Routledge Falmer

Weinberg, J. and Flinders, M. (forthcoming). Learning for Democracy: The Practice and Politics of Citizenship Education in the United Kingdom. *Contact jweinberg1@sheffield.ac.uk for details.*

Westheimer, J., and Kahne, J. (2004). What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy. *American Educational Research Journal,* 41(2), pp. 237-269.

Whiteley, P. (2014). Does Citizenship Education Work? Evidence from a Decade of Citizenship Education in Secondary Schools in England. *Parliamentary Affairs,* 67, p.513–535.

Wolton, S. (2017). The contradiction in the Prevent Duty: Democracy vs 'British values'. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, pp. 1 –20.